

2005 NAIP Survey
Executive Summary
For
North Dakota

USDA
Farm Service Agency

Aerial Photography Field Office

March 2006

Contents

Section	Pages
1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 Purpose and Scope	
1.2 Survey Submittals	
2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary	4-5
Executive Summary Supplemental Documents (Detached):	
Executive Summary Supplemental 1 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 13 (MS Word)	
Executive Summary Supplemental 2 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 14 (MS Word)	

Section 1

1.0 Introduction

The primary purpose of NAIP is to acquire peak growing season “leaf on” imagery, and deliver this imagery to United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) County Service Centers in order to maintain Common Land Unit (CLU) boundaries and assist with crop compliance and a multitude of other farm programs.

As evidenced by the types of customers requesting NAIP imagery, the imagery has other purposes as well. Although our primary customers are States and County Service Centers, other uses for NAIP imagery, including military, real estate, recreation, planning, etc., cannot be overlooked.

NAIP is a program with a relatively short history, beginning with pilot projects in 2001 and 2002, and moving to full volume acquisition in 2003 to 2005, based on funding and partnering. NAIP is moving out of the research and development phase and into sustainment status. By moving into a sustainment phase, a program can build and evaluate a quality business process, and stabilize. Part of this process is evaluating how NAIP is working for its primary customers.

1.1 Purpose and Scope

The focus of this document is to assess in a qualitative manner how NAIP is satisfying customer needs in North Dakota. In other words, “How did APFO do in providing *useful* NAIP imagery for its primary customer?” Answering this question comprises the purpose and scope.

1.2 Survey Submittals

For the initial disposition, the following States were sent surveys to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: WA, OR, OK, KS, NE, MO, IA, MN, WI, IL, IN, OH, CT, and NC. No responses were received from KS or AZ by the 15 Dec 2005 due date. WA noted that they would respond to the survey, but due to imagery delivery/redelivery dates, responses would likely be after 15 Dec.

A second waive of surveys was sent to the following States to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: CA, CO, MT, **ND**, SD, TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, FL, SC, VA, MD, PA, MI, RI, and CT. Responses were requested by 17 Feb, and by 9 Mar for select states which received imagery “late”. Surveys were accidentally sent to CT twice, however, County Service Centers only responded once. LA noted that they would only be able to get a few Counties to complete the survey by the 9 Mar due date. MI noted they would not be able to participate in the survey because of CIR rework that would be completed after the survey due date. MT noted that due to the late distribution of imagery, surveys would likely be returned after the 9 Mar due date. During the second waive of surveys, no survey responses were received by CO, GA, MI, or AL. Surveys received after 9 Mar 06 were not scored.

Section 2

2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary

NAIP Assessment Surveys were provided by email to County Service Centers via the State Office and responses were requested by 17 Feb 06. Out of the responses received, in North Dakota, 1476 of a possible 2580 points were achieved, for a weighted average score out of 1.0 of .572, for a rating of 57.2%. Translated into survey terms, this is an overall rating of “Unsatisfied”. The map on the following page graphically represents overall survey results by county. These results indicate that generally the counties that participated in the survey were not satisfied with 2005 NAIP and that the products did not meet customer needs.

Most textual comments from the survey revolved around timing of imagery acquisition and delivery. Textual comments can be found in the Executive Summary Supplementals 1 and 2. A statistical summary by question of survey results is shown below. Note that Q1-8 are out of a possible 5 points and Q9-10 are out of a possible 10 points. Statistically, questions averaging “unsatisfied” scores included Q1, Q6, Q9, and Q10, “Was the imagery received by your office in time to be useful for crop compliance work?”, “Is the imagery useful for measurement services?”, “Overall, how satisfied are you with 2005 NAIP acquisition and delivery in your County/State?” and “Overall, was 2005 NAIP acquisition and deliver in your County/State timely enough to be useful in support of your programs?” respectively. Statistically, the highest scoring question was Q4, “Is the imagery useful for CLU maintenance?” Q1 was by far the lowest, leading to the conclusion that the imagery was not received by local offices in time for crop compliance.

Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5	
Mean	1.829787234	Mean	3.355555556	Mean	3.806451613	Mean	3.97826087	Mean	3.314285714
Standard Error	0.183296843	Standard Error	0.156203557	Standard Error	0.204357661	Standard Error	0.13722273	Standard Error	0.182289033
Median	1	Median	4	Median	4	Median	4	Median	3
Mode	1	Mode	4	Mode	5	Mode	4	Mode	3
Standard Deviation	1.256619844	Standard Deviation	1.047845312	Standard Deviation	1.1378153	Standard Deviation	0.930689838	Standard Deviation	1.078436465
Sample Variance	1.579093432	Sample Variance	1.097979798	Sample Variance	1.294623656	Sample Variance	0.866183575	Sample Variance	1.16302521
Kurtosis	0.315251233	Kurtosis	0.222152189	Kurtosis	0.523681135	Kurtosis	0.864626111	Kurtosis	-0.300380171
Skewness	1.296690786	Skewness	-1.024432979	Skewness	-0.900423805	Skewness	-0.820113508	Skewness	-0.233035254
Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	4
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5
Sum	86	Sum	151	Sum	118	Sum	183	Sum	116
Count	47	Count	45	Count	31	Count	46	Count	35
Q6		Q7		Q8		Q9_X2		Q10_X2	
Mean	2.977272727	Mean	3.310344828	Mean	3.765957447	Mean	4.625	Mean	4.083333333
Standard Error	0.214408662	Standard Error	0.157750881	Standard Error	0.118629103	Standard Error	0.382026372	Standard Error	0.325937455
Median	3	Median	3	Median	4	Median	4	Median	4
Mode	2	Mode	3	Mode	4	Mode	2	Mode	4
Standard Deviation	1.422226168	Standard Deviation	0.849514495	Standard Deviation	0.813280153	Standard Deviation	2.646756345	Standard Deviation	2.258160929
Sample Variance	2.022727273	Sample Variance	0.721674877	Sample Variance	0.661424607	Sample Variance	7.005319149	Sample Variance	5.09929078
Kurtosis	-1.314646873	Kurtosis	-0.510635997	Kurtosis	-0.607818108	Kurtosis	-0.735557875	Kurtosis	1.057256039
Skewness	0.092572138	Skewness	0.082583028	Skewness	-0.04368049	Skewness	0.654909606	Skewness	1.210929732
Range	4	Range	3	Range	3	Range	8	Range	8
Minimum	1	Minimum	2	Minimum	2	Minimum	2	Minimum	2
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	10	Maximum	10
Sum	131	Sum	96	Sum	177	Sum	222	Sum	196
Count	44	Count	29	Count	47	Count	48	Count	48

2005 NAIP - Overall Qualitative Survey Results

